

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA



Queen's University at Kingston

Presbyterian Church 10.

CONFERENCE ADDRESSES.

SYNOD OF
TORONTO AND KINGSTON.



TOPICS :—

"Obedience to the Last Command, the Secret of Individual Blessing and Power."

"Should we send to the field all approved persons who offer for Foreign Mission Service, trusting to the Church for their support?"

"Sabbath Observance."

ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH, ORANGEVILLE.

MAY, 1895.

F5012
1895
P928

PREFACE.

THE Synodical Conference Committee of 1895 have much pleasure in publishing the addresses that awakened such marked interest at the recent Conference, knowing that they will be valued by all members of Synod, and that, in this permanent form, they are likely to exert an influence that will be beneficial and lasting. The Convener of the Committee has still some copies on hand, one of which will be cheerfully mailed to any one whose name and address may be furnished him for that purpose.

Sincerely yours,

ROBT. S. GOURLAY,

Convener Synod Conference Committee, 1895.

1209448

Sc/UP Nml m-01 Cat. 2553 #1430 + 10⁰⁰ Nov 168

THE SABBATH A SIGN BETWEEN GOD
AND HIS PEOPLE.

BY REV. JAMES MIDDLEMISS, D.D.

IF there is any name in English Christian literature, to which one would be disposed to award the palm for sound common sense, it is that of Archdeacon Paley. For what is commonly known as *genius*, we would not say he was greatly distinguished. But for sound and sinewy common sense, his equal, I venture to say, is hardly to be found in the whole compass of English authorship. And yet, perhaps, it would not be easy to find in any writer of name—in any writer, especially, who can claim rank with Paley—a piece of more inconsequent reasoning, than that in which he undertakes to show that the weekly Sabbath is an institution whose observance was designed to be peculiar to Israel and distinctive of that people.

In Book V. of his work on "Moral and Political Philosophy," the book which treats of "Duties Towards God," the seventh chapter is devoted to the "Scripture Account of Sabbathical Institutions." Paley there expresses his opinion that the weekly Sabbath was first instituted on the occasion of the giving of the miraculous supply of manna, in the wilderness. While his whole argument is open to adverse criticism, especially on the ground of unwarrantable deduction from Scripture, I would ask attention to only one point. I refer to his argument from the fact that "the Sabbath is described as a *sign* between God and the people of Israel"; because I believe the fact that it is so described, is sufficient of itself, if we rightly apprehend what it implies, to prove the universal obligation of the weekly Sabbath. In Exodus xxxi. 13, 16, 17, we read: "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a *sign* between Me and you throughout your generations: that ye may know that I am the Lord God that sanctify you. The children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a *sign* between Me and the children of Israel for ever." And in Ezekiel xx. 12-20: "I

Ms. A. 9. 2. 55. 3. #1430. 4. 10. 2. Nov 168
MS. A. 9. 2. 55. 3. #1430. 4. 10. 2. Nov 168
MS. A. 9. 2. 55. 3. #1430. 4. 10. 2. Nov 168

gave them my Sabbaths, to be a *sign* between Me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them," "And hallow my Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between Me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God."

Referring to these passages, which he quotes more or less fully, Paley says: "It does not seem easy to understand how the Sabbath could be a *sign* between God and the people of Israel, unless the observance of it was peculiar to that people, and designed to be so." I believe you will all agree with me when I say that there is here a specimen of a well known fallacy in reasoning. It shows the oversight of the fact that, while the Sabbath was beyond question peculiar to the people of Israel, it was peculiar to them *as the people of God*, or as a people *distinguished from the heathen*. To infer from this that the Sabbath was designed to be peculiar to the Israelites *as distinguished from Christians*, is not only gratuitous, but in opposition to the only correct inference. That the Sabbath was peculiar to the Israelites as God's people, implies that it is *common to them with Christians*, who, if they are not "Israel after the flesh," are the true Israel, "the children of Abraham the father of the faithful, but by the "circumcision not made with hands." It is common to Christians and to the Israelites as being both the people of God. And it is peculiar to Christians now, as it was peculiar to Israel under the dispensation preceding the present. Let us illustrate this briefly.

It is not an uncommon thing for men to be carried away by the mere sound of a word, instead of first inquiring into the sense and meaning of it. In the present case, our first question should be: What is implied in its being said that the Sabbath was a sign between God and the children of Israel, that they might know that He was the Lord their God? Without going into any verbal criticism, what can it mean but just this: That the Sabbath is an institution so peculiar and distinguishing in the matter of men's relation to God, that its observance is very specially, if not above all else, discriminative of those who serve and honor God from those who do not serve and honor Him, but love this present evil world and serve its god. The observance of the Sabbath accordingly constituted the most patent and prominent distinction between Israel and the heathen nations around them. As a simple matter of fact, such

is the place of the Sabbath in relation to the service of God—the only living and true God—that its observance, both in itself and in its influence on the life in all respects, is so discriminative of the people of God from those who are not His people, that when Israel, God's ancient people, "polluted the Sabbath," or ceased to hallow it, the evidence that Jehovah was their God was very soon entirely lost. As a matter of fact, not merely is the honour of God greatly concerned in the due observance of the Sabbath, but it is so much concerned in it and bound up with it, that where and by whom the Sabbath is duly kept, God is honored, and where and by whom it is disregarded, He is dishonored. Not only is a due observance of the Sabbath an important part of the tribute of honor that is due to God, but it is nothing less than *essential* in the securing of His revenue of honor in every department of it. And, in like manner, not only is a disregard of the Sabbath in itself a withholding of an important and chief part of God's revenue of honor, but its deteriorating power is such, that wherever it prevails, men become utterly godless—God is dishonored in everything and in every way—no portion whatever of His revenue of honor is rendered to Him. So that, as I have said, when the Israelites, instead of hallowing the Sabbath, polluted it, or made it a common day, all distinction between them and the heathen disappeared, and it could not be known from the way in which they lived, that Jehovah was their God, any more than He was the God of the heathen round about them. And it is so still, and will always be. The Sabbath is still and will always be a *sign* between God and His people that He is the Lord their God. The Sabbath is still, and will always be, a sign between God and the men and nations that serve and honor Him. Those who duly observe the Sabbath are the men and the nations that serve Him and honor Him, by having "respect to all His commandments"; and those who disregard the Sabbath are the men and the nations who have respect to *none* of His commandments, who render to Him no part of the honor that is due to Him, but dishonor Him in everything. Not only is the hallowing of the Sabbath such a conspicuous and important part of God's revenue of honor, that those who hallow it, in their very doing so, greatly honour Him, and those who disregard it, are, in that very disregard, guilty of withholding from God a main part of the

honour due to Him ; but such is the essential connection between the hallowing of the Sabbath and our regard for God and our obedience to Him in all other respects, that those who hallow the Sabbath are, invariably and without exception, those who honor and obey God in every thing, and those who disregard the Sabbath are, as invariably and without exception those who are utterly godless and honour and obey God in nothing. So that whenever and wherever, be it under the Jewish economy or under the Christian dispensation, the Sabbath ceases to be hallowed, then and there, all distinction between God's professing people and those who know Him not disappears.

In short, then, we are so much at issue with Paley, in his inference from the Scripture "description" or designation of the Sabbath as a *sign* between God and His ancient people, that we regard it not only as warranting the precisely opposite conclusion, but as being sufficient of itself to bear the whole weight of it—the conclusion, namely, that the Sabbath is of universal obligation, always and everywhere, as a "sign" between God, i.e., Jehovah, and His people. In a word, therefore, inasmuch as "there is one God, and there is none other but He" (Mark xii. 32), that the Sabbath is a *sign* means, No Sabbath, no God.

**WHOM SHALL THE CHURCH SEND TO THE
FOREIGN MISSION FIELD?**

BY REV. J. A. TURNBULL, L.L.B.

MORE fully stated the question to be considered in this paper is : Should we send to the field all approved persons who offer for Foreign Mission service, trusting to the Church for their support ?

No more important question could possibly be asked, for on the right answer to it most momentous consequences depend. The course we have been following in the past has been to await the contributions of the Church and to regard these as indicating the extent to which we are for the present to obey the command of Christ. That very indifferent success has resulted from this method all must admit, for whilst in the aggregate much has been done, for which we must look up with gratitude to God, many comparisons can be instituted which may well cause the Christian Church to hang her head in shame, holding, as she does, a lamp in her hand but refusing to carry it to the countess, benighted millions.

Shall we, then, continue to follow this method, secure the money and then advance, money in hand, or shall we go forward trusting that the money will follow and be on hand when needed ? That the former will be deemed the more cautious cannot be denied ; but that the latter is characterized by faith is equally unquestionable. Not a single word would we speak in disparagement of caution, but there are virtues which may be carried to such an extent that they assume a very different complexion. Many an opportunity has been suffered to go by unimproved through over-caution. On the other hand faith never can become excessive provided it rests on a sure foundation.

To prevent all possible misunderstanding, and to present the subject in a more pointed manner we shall take the liberty of altering the wording so as to read "trusting to the Lord, through His Church, to support them." To this question we

give an affirmative answer, and shall endeavor to justify it by reasons.

1st. The great need of the heathen and their accessibility. Although almost nineteen hundred years have elapsed since the great commission to evangelize the world was given to the Christian Church, very little, comparatively speaking has been accomplished. Three-fourths of the population of the globe have never heard the message of salvation. True they have the consciousness of a Supreme being, and some kind of religion of their own, which is calculated to debase rather than to elevate. But there is only one true religion, that which rests on the sacrifice of Calvary, and whatever there may be of good in the other so called religions apart from Christ, there is no salvation. We are thus forced to face the appalling facts that the stream of time is carrying down to the ocean of eternity millions of unsaved souls. We may wait for the contributions of the Church to render progress possible, but this great river pauses, no, not for a single moment. Whilst we are waiting souls are perishing.

This fact is rendered all the more telling when we consider that so many barriers have been removed, and countries rendered accessible to missionary work, as is the case in our day. At the commencement of this century there were very few countries outside of Christian lands which the missionary was permitted to enter. But prayer ascended from the Church of God for open doors, and to-day there are only two places to which the missionary may not go, the country of Thibet and the city of Mecca, and on the frontier of the former a pionser band, led by Miss Annie Taylor, is encamped learning the language and waiting for God to prepare the way. Do not these perishing souls with their Macedonian cry, do not these open doors appeal to the Christian Church to hasten to the rescue?

2nd. The fact that so many consecrated men and women are offering themselves for the work, many of whom ask for no guarantee of support from man, but are willing to trust the Master to feed and clothe His servants. In 1885 and 1886 eighteen hundred students in the United States and Canada signed a declaration that they were willing and desirous, God permitting, to be foreign missionaries. In 1887 there was held a convention of 145 Theological students, who appealed to the

Church stating that "funds do not warrant the board in sending forth those who apply," and asking the question : ' Must we stay at home for lack of money ? ' When the Holy Ghost said " Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them " did the Church of that day or the leaders in the Church answer, " We must wait until the money for their support has been contributed." The cry for help has come to us from many distant lands, the description of their woeful condition has harrowed our souls, and in response many young men of marked intelligence and pronounced consecration have risen up, saying, " Here are we, send us." What answer shall we give these servants of the Master? Shall we dampen their ardor and weaken their faith by saying, No money, no money?

3rd. The Church possesses the ability, or by the faithful discharge of duty would possess it, to extend the gospel far beyond anything hitherto attempted. It is said that nine-tenths of the money contributed to Foreign Missions is given by one-tenth of the people, the majority of the members contributing little or nothing. Dr. Josiah Strong estimates that there is wealth amounting to \$13,000,000,000 now in the hands of the Christians of the United States, and these Christians gave last year \$5 000,000 to foreign missions, or one twenty-sixth part of one per cent. of their means; and we are informed, that excluding the money contributed by the Women's Foreign Missionary Society, the Presbyterian Church in Canada gave to Foreign Missions during the past year at the rate of twenty-five or twenty-six cents per member. The Church membership of Protestant Christendom on both sides of the Atlantic is estimated at 40,000,000. One cent per Sabbath would secure \$20,800,000 per year, instead of the \$14,588,354 at present given. Can it be said that to ask for one cent per Sabbath from each member for foreign mission work is to make an exorbitant demand? It would double the offerings of the Canadian Church. Can we claim in the face of these figures that we have been giving up to or beyond our ability?

Moreover our ability to give is not all it might be. We are living financially beneath our privileges. Hard times have cast their dark shadow over the land, and the effect is felt in both church and state. Where shall we look for the remedy?

Not down, but up—up to Him who said, "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase, so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in Mine house, and prove Me now herewith, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

Are men honoring God with their substance, where, with the heathen world groping in the dark and calling for the light, they are giving one dollar from every \$2,600 they possess to give it to them? Since the converse of the promise and condition is true, so flagrant has been the neglect of the Church for the greater part of nineteen hundred years, and so meagre are her givings in this last decade of this enlightened century, as with a niggardly hand she doles out her few cents per member, we need not be surprised that there are hard times in harmony with man's hard-heartedness toward the perishing. When the bill to incorporate the American Board was before the Massachusetts Senate, a member said, "We have no surplus of religion to export," to which it was answered, "Religion is a commodity of which the more we export the more we have." Let us put God to the proof—for He says: "Prove Me now herewith"—and see if this is not true of money as well as of Christian spirit. We are responsible for more than present ability, we are responsible for all we may be by the grace of God, and to the individual members of the Church, and to the Church as a whole there would come such an outpouring of the Spirit and such manifest blessings that we would possess more abundant life, for the Dead Sea is the Dead Sea, because it is always receiving and never giving, having no outlet.

4th. The command is so explicit and the path of duty is so clearly marked out that no doubt can for a moment harbor in any heart. The promise was given to Christ, "The heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," and He has commanded His servants to make good the promise by going into all the world and preaching the gospel to every creature. Well then, may we, as we examine the command in this light and in that, hear the "Iron Duke" saying, "Look to your marching orders, sir!" If there were any

question as to the persons by whom, the time when, or the places in which this work is to be done, then we would require to wait for indications when to advance and where. Then the preceding reasons would be but so many indications which in order to be conclusive would require to be supplemented by the one relating to money. If, on the other hand, the command is absolute and universal, we do not require to wait for indications, but must, through the doors opened in answer to prayer, by the hand of God Himself, enter and in His name possess the land.

Our desire to obey and the willingness of so many men and women to devote their lives to this glorious work is but a hint of the great extent of the command, for we may rest satisfied that our desire to see souls saved can never equal far less surpass Christ's willingness to save them; and if we seek in dependance on God to realize our utmost desire, He will give us the ability. Some seven years ago the Church of England Missionary Society "resolved to send all suitable men definitely called to this work, funds or no funds." The number of missionaries has during the seven years increased from 309 to 619 and the general fund income from £200,777 to £237,795, and although the staff has been doubled the society is only £6,000 worse off than it was in 1887. This surely is evidence that the Master does not forsake the servant who strives to obey His commands.

5th. Because it is our blessed privilege to do our duty and trust to the Lord for success. The rule for Christian life and work is, "by faith and not by sight;" and whilst caution and the proper exercise of all our faculties are not to be despised or neglected, there is a field which they may never enter, and through which faith alone can lead us. The Word of God in command and promise is to be the guide and sanction of our conduct; and when we have this as our authority surely we escape the charge of presumption and do not forfeit the claim to caution. To go forward because the path is pleasant and to our liking, trusting that the Lord will follow, is presumption; but to follow our Captain when He gives the word of command is to exercise faith. To go forward without command is not only to run risks but to court certain defeat; to go forward when God commands is to possess an assurance, which is not of sight but of faith

that the Lord will provide. Such an assurance is well rooted and will ripen into the assurance of hope for "the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

We all know how George Muller has carried on his great work for sixty years. In his own words: "I decided more than 60 years ago, that by God's help I would rely upon Him alone for assistance in the way of obtaining pecuniary supplies, and would not in the hour of need make known my necessities to any human beings whatever, and to this plan I have adhered without ever swerving from it." What has been the result? Has God forgotten or neglected this faithful servant? Far otherwise! He has received during those sixty years, for the various objects of his institution over £1,341 826 sterling. Well may we repeat these figures and say "with God nothing is impossible," and "all things are possible to him that believeth." If George Muller can do this, why not a whole Church; and if God has so honored his faith in connection with his Orphanage, why not ours in connection with the Salvation of the heathen?

Abraham manifested his faith in God by obedience to His command. When called on by God to leave country, home and kindred "he went out not knowing whither he went." And when commanded to offer up his only son as a burnt offering, he proceeded to obey, although God had revealed to him that through this son the promise would be fulfilled, "accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead." He knew the command of God, all else was dark, but he was content to walk by faith, and not by sight, and doing so he honored God and was honored by Him. Does our duty, nay our privilege, fall short of this? If there were any question as to the need, if there were not so many consecrated men and women offering themselves for service in the foreign field, if there were any doubt as to the ability of the Church to do more than she is at present doing, if there were any uncertainty as to the command of Christ, then we would be justified in waiting. But when concerning all these our information is so ample and positive, and our convictions so deep and clear, we will honor God by our faith, and God will honor our faith with abundant success.

An early Christian writer said both truthfully and tersely "all God's biddings are enablings." Making use of this expres-

sion the question we must ask ourselves is this, Shall we do God's bidding, and trust Him for the enabling, or shall we delay obeying the former until sight has made the latter certain? To ask the question is to answer it. The old negro's explanation of obedience may provoke a smile but it will meet with the hearty approval of all whose lives are guided by the Word of God, "Bredren, what eber de good God tell me to do in dis blessed book, dat I'm gwine to do. If I see in it that I must jump troo a stone wall, I'm gwine to jump at it. Goin' troo it belongs to God, jumping at it 'longs to me." Is there in any mind a doubt as to the will of Christ concerning the heathen? If not then surely compliance is imperative, and confidence in God a blessed privilege. Carey's motto answers in the affirmative the question asked in our subject and expresses most beautifully what we conceive should be the attitude of the Christian Church toward poor, perishing humanity—"Attempt great things for God, expect great things from God,"

ON SENDING TO THE FOREIGN FIELD ALL
APPROVED CANDIDATES TRUSTING
FOR FUNDS.

BY REV. R. P. MACKAY, B.A.

ONE would like to speak on this question with great caution, for we are, I am persuaded, at a critical point in our history as a Church. May we not be situated somewhat as the Israelites were when they came to the door of the promised land, and refused to enter because of the difficulties in their way? They saw and appreciated the difficulties but did not appreciate the Omnipotent power behind them, and in whose strength Caleb and Joshua urged them to advance. They refused and returned to wander and to die in the wilderness.

I do not venture to say that that is our position—nor do I say that it is not. I am an enquirer—we are all that—trying to feel our way and find out God's will in this matter.

1. *The Need.*—There is no time to speak of the need, and yet I imagine that here the root of our hesitation and indifference lies. If we saw the need as it is, we would be prepared to take risks, to become what the world might call rash in order if possible to save some. The Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us," is the Divine formula of the condition of the heathen world in all ages. They are in the need of help. That cry sometimes finds expression to-day in the field. The heathen themselves ask that missionaries be sent. Sometimes they remonstrate with them for being so tardy in bringing the gospel.

But whether that *longing*, that cry becomes vocal or not, ever finds expression or not, it is the attitude of any people without Christ. They need help, for they are unhappy and they have no hope in the future.

Future State.—The edge is taken off this sense of urgency by the pretty common feeling that after all the heathen are not lost, that in some way provision is made for them.

Now how are we to know? We have on the one hand human speculations as to what is called the "Historic Christ," whose

influence reaches these people and becomes their salvation although they have never heard of Him. And our own sympathies go in that direction. On the other hand we have the direct, explicit, and manifold statements of God's word that they are lost. The apostles met the same kind of heathenism we have to-day. It has not changed, and they the inspired apostles say they are lost. They say that they are alienated from God and the enemies of God (Col. i. 21); that they are without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise, without hope and without God in the world (Eph. ii. 11-12); that their lives are the lives of the lost, that they are dead in trespasses and sins, that they walk according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience, that they have their conversation in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and are by nature the children of wrath, even as others (Eph. ii. 1, 2, 3); that their understandings are darkened, that they are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them because of the hardness of their hearts, they are past feeling having given themselves over to work all uncleanness with greediness (Eph. iv. 18, 19); that they worship devils (Gal. iv. 8); that their prayers are vain repetitions (Matt. vi. 7); that they will be condemned by a law that is within themselves (Rom. i. 18-23); that they who are saved are saved by a preached gospel. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard" (Rom. x. 13-15).

Now, in the face of such plain, unmistakable statements as these, how is it possible that men who believe in an inspired Word can comfort themselves with the thought that after all in some way it will come all right, Christ's influence will reach them?

Surely it is not answer enough to that to raise the question as to unconscious children, or to raise the question as to the future of Socrates, or a Plato, or a Zoraster, or a Buddha! It is enough to say in the first place that the Bible makes no distinction as to men that are out of Christ, that the Bible knows no Saviour but Christ, and in the second place that amongst the

heathen such men are rarely if ever found. The testimony of missionaries so far as I have read is that the heathen are properly described in the first chapter of Romans. They are so corrupt that they have lost the idea of holiness.

Heathenism has a thousand tongues in its self denials, self-crucifixions, self-tortures, every one of which is an appeal for help and remonstrance against the half heartedness and indifference of the Church as to their perishing condition. If these things are so, ought we not to give due consideration to a question like this? Surely we should know that there is ground to justify our action before refusing to send out men who are approved and pressing their services upon the Church. Yet we must not allow impulse to carry us away, and expose ourselves to the charge of fanaticism. There are three sources of light and guidance, which if we follow we shall not err. We all believe that there is a leading of the Spirit, a still small voice that prompts us. But sometimes men are misled, thinking they are moved by the Holy Spirit when they are not. Satan's whispers may be taken for the whispers of the Spirit. We need some test.

In addition we need to know the mind of God as revealed in His word. "To the law and to the testimony." Any tendency that agrees not with that should be rejected. Sometimes, however, men go astray even there. They take a verse of Scripture and misapply it, and do foolish things. The Word is right, but their application of it is wrong. We need to interpret Scripture in the light of history and providence and environment. If these three are complied with we will not wander far from the path of duty. If we follow the first without the second we shall be visionaries. If the second without the third we shall be impractical. But all three will guide us safely. Now let us answer a few questions.

First Question :—Does the proposal agree with the first test, the promptings of our spirits? I think with one accord we shall say "Yes." All will respond that if the coast is clear, if it is prudent, if it will not lead to complications we would rejoice to send out all approved men and women who may apply.

Second Question :—Does it agree with the second and third tests, with the Word of God, and with history? Or, to put the question in another form, Do we find in the Word of God and history that men have been called and sent of God without

guarantee of salary in advance? That is the real question. Not whether it is desirable that men be sent out. But whether we should send them out not knowing where the salary is to come from.

Is it not in line with the teaching of Christ and of the apostles? Is it not in line with the practice of the apostles and of post-apostolic times? Look at the record of St. Patrick and Columba and Ulfilas and Columbanus and Boniface and Anskar amongst the Norsemen, and the Nestorians in India. And in more modern times the work of the Moravians, and of Louis Harms in Hungary, and Gossner, the founder of the faith missions as they are called. Surely if anything is certified by the Word of God and by providence it is this, that the call does not include the guarantee of salary in advance. The call simply meant in these cases that men were moved by the Holy Ghost to feel for their perishing fellowmen and they went forth to tell the gospel story believing that He who called them would supply every need. Their guarantee was the promise of God which is after all a better guarantee than that of any human treasury.

This Question :—Has God called these men? They think so themselves. They have had their thoughts led in that direction, they have studied with that in view, they have the physical and intellectual qualifications so far as men can judge. I have no doubt that when the Committee meets they will think so. There is no fault to find, they are approved men, chosen, called of God for this purpose.

Fourth Question :—Does God want these men to go? If He called them He wants them to go. There will be no difference of opinion upon that point.

Fifth Question :—If He calls and they go in obedience to that call, or the Church sends in obedience to that call, will God disappoint and fail to honor that faith? Nobody will venture to say that He will. We believe faith will be honored according to promise, and that their needs will be met. There is no lack of testimony from individuals and institutions upon that point to-day, in missionary and many other kinds of Christian enterprise. It is too late to argue that question.

Sixth Question :—If that principle were adopted should we not have to adopt the indefinite salary, and say to the missionaries you must be prepared to accept whatever comes. Now

that does not necessarily follow. There is, I think, altogether too much made of the question of fixed salaries. Both are right and Scriptural. The penny a day was a fixed wage, approved by the Master Himself. In fact commercial laws are divine, as are all natural and spiritual laws. We are as much in line with divine teaching when we say a definite salary is to be attached to a definite service as we are when we leave it an indefinite thing, always, of course, with the understanding that, in all human arrangements, there is an element of indefiniteness. Nobody has a certainty of his promised salary. Events may occur that will make it impossible to pay, but there is certainty that we shall be provided for sufficiently if we have faith in God. Whatever else fails, His promise never will.

Seventh Question:—Does it not imply a reduction in salaries? Do the societies that act upon this principle not give very low salaries? To that I have two answers to give.

(1). So far as it is a question of how much a missionary needs and ought to get, it is to be settled simply by experience. They who live in these foreign countries are the best judges. It is by the gathering of such information that nearly all the great societies of Christendom have come to adopt pretty nearly the same average salary. Some a little higher and some a little lower, but ranging about the same figure. Can we trust our missionaries to tell us the truth in this matter? Are they honest men fit to be sent out as the representatives of Christ? If so can we not rely upon their testimony as to what they need in order to do their work effectively? If anybody thinks not then that person should move to have them recalled.

(2) In the second place I ask whether it is in accordance with God's ordinary method to keep men down to the absolute necessities? Is He not generous? Does He not even lavishly bestow His good things upon men? And if so, are we to believe that it is pleasing to Him that His servants, His most loved and obedient servants, His servants that are most like Himself in service—is it His pleasure that such workers should be paired down to their barest necessities? I do not think so, to think so is not honoring to Him. If the Church should take this proposed step, it should be taken with the confident expectation that a reasonable competency will be provided.

Now gather these points together:—That the need is very

great and very urgent ; that it is in line with the inward impulse of the Christian heart, with the teaching of God's Word and of history ; that it is not a fact that in God's call an advance guarantee of stipend is included ; that these candidates believe themselves to be called and the Church believes they are called of God ; that God wants all whom He calls to go, believing that they whom He wants to go will be provided for, if they go in faith ; that it is as much in line with God's will that there should be a definite salary as an indefinite one ; that no change is needed in that respect ; that we should expect from God generous supply, which is in line with all His dealings with His children. And may I not add that it is most honoring to God ? Surely it is more honoring to Him that we should accept His leading—send out men whom we believe He has qualified to go—than that we should hesitate and say, " No, we can do nothing until we see where the money is coming from ? "

Now when I have said all that, if you ask me whether our Church should take this step at this time, I hesitate and say, " I am not sure about it. " It is not because times are hard. Times are never hard with God. It is simply because I do not know whether there is faith in the Church to prevent disappointments and harm. God's promises are in answer to faith. Without faith we cannot please Him. We need faith in the missionaries and in the people too. We ought to have that faith and ought not to lose this opportunity ; but it is not enough that a committee of fifteen or twenty men should do this. The Church should act—go forward and the sea will divide. Is the Church ready ?

THE RELATION THE SABBATH BEARS TO SPIRITUALITY IN THE CHURCH.

BY REV. JOHN BURTON, B.D.

MY view of that relation is expressed in one word—*necessary*; and my remarks will be an endeavor to substantiate that position. For the sake of brevity and of clearness it may be well to define in some measure at least our terms. In speaking of the Sabbath I am not concerned with any question as to its precise position in the calendar, whether it begins at eventide, at midnight, or at cockcrow; or whether any other day would answer this necessitous claim; I find the week a practically universal division of time, and in all our Anglo-Saxon, Celtic or Latin nations its first day, from midnight to midnight, designated the Sabbath, or the Lord's day. I see no reason for seeking another division, or for disturbing that very general institution the Christian observance of which I hold to be necessary for continued spirituality in the Christian Church.

Spirituality is defined for me (Acts i. 5): "Power to be Christ's witnesses unto the uttermost parts of the earth." The mystic who would spend his time "in holy contemplation" away from the haunts of his sinful fellows is not witnessing for Christ *to the uttermost parts of the earth*; nor they who sing,

"Lord bless and pity us
Shine on us with thy face,"

with heart and voice, and continue with only parrot like iteration

"That the earth thy way and nations all
May know Thy saving grace."

I confess from childhood up to an inward grudge against Bunyan's pilgrim that in his eagerness to reach the heavenly city he left his wife and little ones behind in the city of Destruction. I strive the rather to fill the post in which Jesus by prayer left

His disciples (John xvii. 15, 21) to do His work, that the world may believe. The spiritual is the practical.

In practical science we read of dynamics. A vessel has to be built for ocean transit, dynamical laws are considered ; so much water has to be displaced, so much resistance must be overcome, according to these dynamic requirements, engines, furnaces, lines are built. Science loves learned names. In that word "dynamics" we may recognize *dunamis*, power. There are laws therefore of Christian power ; or, if the learned name sounds better, Christian dynamics ; for power to witness is Christian spirituality or life ; and for that powers development, I plead for the right use of the Sabbath as a necessity.

Suffer a little more skirmishing. There is an indescribable but very manifest character about spirituality, or Christian power ; a marked contrast between mere performance, and the performance of power. The music box gives forth sweet melody and is delightful to the lazy mood of the evening hour after sultry toil ; but the zither touched with living fingers has a soul unknown to the more complex mechanism. Witnessing for Christ is in truth a practical thing, but it is not a mere round of duty ; it is the spontaneous outflow of the Christ life within. Dives may endure Lazarus at his gate, and patronize him with the crumbs, but "the name of a disciple" giving even a humble portion will be a benediction, under whose benignity the heart bounds with joy. Spirituality in the Church is not merely keeping its treasury full, erecting suitable places for worship, and providing all things needed for the orderly dispensation of all the ordinances ; it is all this and more ; not only the reunited bones with sinews and with flesh, but the life breathed through all ; the living army of the living God.

All streams cease where the clouds drop not down their rain ; the storm that sways the forest only stimulates the sturdy growth of the tree that has its roots deep and wide spread in the soil. The finite cannot continually give without constantly receiving ; nor can power to witness be maintained without repairing the waste incurred in the exercise. The Church that has no Sabbath dies ; the Church that misuses the day of rest becomes degraded. The Puritan Sabbath has been made the subject of many a jest ; it had its forbidding aspects ; but it nourished a race of men that knew whom they trusted, and were

ready for His cross and crown to go to prison or to death. Whether our Sunday sacred concerts, solo singing, and endeavor to increase the collections by advertisings, will meet the agnostic tendency of the age and hand down to our children a heritage such as our father's bequeathed to us of stability and faith is a question I would earnestly press my readers to consider. Let me give an example:—One of the elders of my first charge was the practical maker and owner of the village. An extensive tannery, grist and saw mills were but part of his business cares; and every employee was an object to him of personal interest. "What should I do without the Sabbath?" he more than once said to me; "I meet with so much misrepresentation in business, so much dishonesty in competition, incessant eye service and ingratitude day by day, that at the end of the week I find myself getting hard, vindictive, distrustful; forgetful of the good people I meet and the fair treatment I receive. I need the Sabbath to tone up; and, thank God, I can generally go down to the office on Monday morning at peace with all, and kindly disposed even to the bad. I never allow myself to decide upon a lawsuit during the closing days of the week. The Sabbath brings me back to the better frame of mind." In that experience you have an entire volume of argument, illustration and application. Church life and individual do well to "read, mark, learn and inwardly digest." That friend was passionately fond of music; he felt the need of the Songs of Zion in the sanctuary; he had great taste for the æsthetic, but springs of life his soul longed for; the Sabbath was made for him, he used and enjoyed its worship and its hours; he lived more than by bread alone.

"Feed the flock of God" is a divine injunction, but time is needed for feeding purposes, and feeding is not amusing. Food need not be unsavoury, but food, not "fixings," is needed for nourishment, and the hasty or perfunctory performance of Sabbath feeding produces spiritual dyspepsia with all its pessimism, grumblings and lassitude, as surely as the hurried meal at the city lunch counters hurries the business man on to ruined nerves and health. I can see no hope for a progressive Christianity, the reception of power to be Christ's witnesses unto the uttermost parts of the earth, apart from a consecrated Sabbath. Pleasant Sunday afternoons, Sunday evening sacred concert

services, may, with the Christian Sabbath sacredly kept, do something to interest the masses ; but the trusting such aids will practically duplicate the experience of an African mission which had freely dealt out b'ankets to the converts. A chieftain being refused a further supply went off to his tribe with the cry, " Good, no more blankets! No more Hallelujahs," and went back to his fetishes. No more concerts, no more crowds, no more five cent bits. Truly the old gospel in its living application to present needs with its one day in seven specially set apart for its inculcation six days for its manifestation, is still the most potent witness for Him who came to save, who still lives for continued supplication for us, and who will come again when His bride is ready to enter with Him into the eternal habitation.

THE LAW OF THE SABBATH AND ITS PRESENT OBLIGATION.*

BY REV. J. MCD. DUNCAN, B.A.

THIS is the subject to be discussed in this paper. By the "Law of the Sabbath" we are to understand the Fourth Commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates.

Concerning this commandment two questions are suggested by the title of our topic, viz.: First, What is the meaning of this law; and, secondly, Is this a law of present obligation? The answer to the first of these questions need not detain us long. The command before us is easily understood. It requires the cessation, during one day in seven, of secular employments. It answers to the demands of man's physical, intellectual and moral nature by providing for a weekly day of rest. On this day it is intended that the body should regain by repose its freshness and vigor, that by varying its occupations the mind should recover its clearness and strength; that by withdrawal into a clearer atmosphere, the spirit should be quickened and purified.

The rest required by this commandment is not inactivity. We are told that God rested on the seventh day "from all His work which He had made." This does not mean that God became inactive. He ceased from a particular class of works which had occupied the six creative days. But the divine activity manifests itself in other ways on the seventh day. The occupations of the redeemed in heaven may furnish us with

* This paper professes only to have gathered together some of the leading arguments advanced by those who have maintained that the law of the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual commandment.

an example of the way in which our Sabbaths should be spent. The spirits of the just "rest from their labors." They have entered into peace. That rest is not opposed to activity but to hurry, distraction, toil, uneasiness. In heaven there is ceaseless activity. "His servants shall serve Him." "They rest not day and night, saying Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty which was and is and is to come." A spirit can find rest only in activity. The true Sabbath rest consists in withdrawing our attention from what is seen, transitory, unsatisfying and fixing it upon the unseen, the eternal, the satisfying. True rest is not inactivity, but satisfaction. The weekly Sabbath is fitted to give us opportunities for the earnest, loving contemplation of God as revealed in His word, in His works, in His Son. In such holy occupation should this day be spent.

The Sabbath is a day of rest. And the rest of the Sabbath is a religious rest. It is such a rest as those require who are not merely animals, but spirits as well. This rest leaves no room for idleness, but affords ample scope for all the activities of our spiritual nature.

It need scarcely be said that the interpretation put upon the Sabbath law by the Jewish rabbis is to be rejected. The meaning of the Fourth Commandment is not expressed but perverted by the tradition which decided that on a Sabbath a nailed shoe might not be worn because it was a burden, but that an unnailed shoe might be worn; that a person might go out with two shoes on, but not with only one; that one might carry a loaf of bread, but that two might not carry it between them. Moses was not represented, but caricatured by those who found fault with the disciples for plucking the ears of corn and rubbing them in the palms of their hands and blowing away the chaff and eating, and who would condemn even walking on the green grass on the Sabbath because that was a species of threshing. Very different from the interpretation put upon this law by the rabbis, is that given by the Lord of the Sabbath. According to Him the performance of works of necessity and mercy does not constitute a breach of the law regarding the Sabbath.

The law of the Sabbath as found in the Fourth Commandment must be distinguished from other Mosaic legislation concerning the Sabbath. We read in Exodus xxxv. 15, "Whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day shall be put to death."

And again, we read that a man found gathering sticks upon the Sabbath day was put to death for his offence. Such legislation, of course, was entirely Judaic. No one regards it as binding on any nation now. But the fact that such laws as that which required a man to be put to death for Sabbath breaking are obsolete, no more proves that the law of the Sabbath contained in the Fourth Commandment is obsolete, than the abolition of the death penalty for adultery or blasphemy proves that the Third and Seventh Commandments have ceased to be binding upon men. It is not ingenuous, it can scarcely be considered honest, to represent those who maintain the perpetual obligation of a command found in the decalogue as maintaining also the perpetual obligation of requirements found in the ceremonial law.

We come now to the second question to be considered in this paper. Is the Sabbath law a law of present obligation? From a very early period two opinions have been held concerning this matter. One opinion is that the sanctification of one day in every seven was a ceremonial, typical and Levitical custom and was therefore abolished when a better dispensation came. The laws of the state very properly secure weekly rest from worldly labors as a social and civic blessing. Public and associated worship of Christians is a scriptural duty. No day is so suitable for such worship as the weekly day of rest especially since it commemorates the resurrection of Christ. But this is all. To sanctify the whole day under the supposed authority of a divine command is Judaizing. The other opinion is expressed in the Westminster Confession and held by Presbyterians throughout the world. It regards the law of the Sabbath as a moral and perpetual commandment binding all men in all ages. As briefly as possible I shall try to present the chief arguments which have come under my notice in support of the latter opinion, viz.: that the law of the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual commandment.

1. The Sabbath was instituted prior to the Mosaic legislation. In the Book of Genesis, after giving an account of creation, the sacred writer proceeds as follows:—"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished and all the host of them, and on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had

made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made."

Those who have held the Sabbath to be a mere Judaical appointment, have contended that the writer of Genesis is not in this passage giving an account of something which happened at the creation, but is anticipating the institution of the Sabbath. Their opinion is that the Sabbath was instituted at Sinai and not at the creation. Two considerations seem to be fatal to this interpretation. The first is the place which this passage occupies in the narrative of Genesis. In the first chapter of that book, we have a simple straightforward account of the works which God performed. Then the writer, continuing his story, tells us that God, having finished these works at the end of six days, rested on the seventh. It is difficult to see how any one who has not a theory to support, can hold that in the first chapter of Genesis we have an account of events which took place at the creation, while in the earliest verses of the second chapter, we have an anticipation of an event which was to occur many hundreds of years afterwards. The plain man reading his Bible sees in the words "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it" a statement of what God did after the work of creation was finished. If he is told that he is wrong, and that the writer is speaking of something that God was to do in the future, he will probably conclude that the Bible is a book intended only for the learned. There is a second consideration, which makes against the view, that in this passage we have merely an anticipation of a coming event. It is this. Unless the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, we find no account in the narrative of Genesis, of any provision for the needs of man's spiritual nature. Is it conceivable that God should make man in His own image and then, while giving him authority to use the products of the earth for the supply of his bodily wants, should make no provision for the wants of his soul? It is surely more natural to suppose that the Creator, after giving His creature directions as to the support of his bodily life, indicated by His own example, the means by which the spiritual life of man was to be nourished.

There are many indications of Sabbath observance during

the patriarchal period. From the earliest times *seven* was a sacred and symbolical number among both Israelites and pagans. How is the meaning attached to this number to be explained? No natural sign in the heavens or earth suggests the number. For no heavenly body revolves in precisely seven months, days or hours. Nor do any of man's external members number seven. A reasonable explanation of this use of the number *seven* is found in the early institution of the week.

Other facts point still more clearly to the conclusion that the observance of the Sabbath was a part of the patriarchal religion. It was "at the end of days" that Cain and Abel offered their sacrifices. This phrase probably refers to the weekly Sabbath. God Himself observed the weekly interval in making preparation for the flood. Noah twice waited for a period of seven days before he sent out his dove. It was customary among the patriarchs in Mesopotamia, in the days of Laban to continue a wedding feast a week. From the history of Jacob's life we learn that the number seven was used to limit the ordinary duration of a contract. The feast of the Passover was to last a week. This appointment was made before there were any Levitical institutions. The account of the manna, found in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, shows that the law of the Sabbath was then in full force. Observe what happened. Of their own accord the people on the sixth day gathered twice as much of the manna as they gathered on other days. They received no directions to do this. They acted as if they were conforming to an established custom. Then Moses, when his attention was called to the conduct of the people, mentioned the Sabbath quite incidentally. He said to the rulers that the people had done quite right in gathering a double quantity on the sixth day. He added, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." We have here no formal, solemn declaration of a new law, but an incidental, informal reference to a law already recognized to be in force. The birth place of this institution of the Sabbath is not the wilderness of Sin. The events which occurred there refer back to an earlier appointment. Now the argument from these facts is clear and direct. The law of the Sabbath was in force before the Mosaic legislation was received. It is admitted by all that the ceremonial portion of the Mosaic legislation has been abolished. But if

this law existed before the legislation of Moses was enacted, its authority cannot be affected by the abolition of the later legislation. The authority of the Sabbath law was recognized but not created at Sinai. We cannot infer from the repeal of ceremonial laws given at Sinai, that the law of the Sabbath has been repealed. This institution existed before the Levitical types and shadows, and it survives while they have perished.

2. I go on to a second argument to prove that the law of the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual commandment. The Sabbath law is found among the moral precepts of the Mosaic Legislation. There is a clear distinction between the law of the ten commandments and the laws of the Judaic ritual and polity. The ten commandments were uttered by the great voice of God and written with His own finger. The other laws were spoken in the ears of Moses alone and the hand of Moses wrote them. The decalogue written twice on tables of stone was deposited in the ark; where it was preserved by the incorruptible Shittim wood, the gold overlaid, within, without and above, and the over-shadowing Cherubim and Shechinah. The laws intended for the Jews only were written on parchment and placed, not in, but beside the ark, as being of less value and ready to be removed. Now the law of the Sabbath has its place among the ten commandments. This law was uttered by the divine Voice. Its words were written by the finger of God. It was inscribed upon the table of stone. It was intrusted to the ark for safe keeping. There is nothing to warrant the belief that this law was intended for the Jews only. There is no reason to suppose that it belonged only to a covenant which was to be abolished.

It may be shown that the fourth commandment is necessary to the completeness of the first table. We are not to look upon the laws of this table as merely negative. Their requirements are not satisfied by not setting up any object of worship in the place of God, or by not worshipping idols or by not blaspheming. The second commandment promises mercy to 'them that love Me.' But love is not satisfied with abstaining from evil. It must be busy doing good. Love does more than refrain from disobedience. It expresses itself in active obedience. How can love express itself when its object is God. If He were hungry He would not tell us. The creature cannot add to the

ineffable blessedness of the Creator. Love to God finds an outlet in worship, in communion, in shutting out worldly things and fixing the attention upon Him. Now, in order that there may be opportunities for worship, for communion, for withdrawal from worldly concerns, it is necessary that there should be such a provision as is made in the law of the Sabbath. There must be some time set apart for the religious duties which are imposed by the first three commands of the decalogue. If it be admitted that the first and second and third commandments are moral and perpetual, it follows that the fourth Commandment also is moral and perpetual. For it prescribes the means by which the duties required in the other commandments may be performed, and when a work is obligatory, the means necessary to its performance are also obligatory. Worship is obligatory. Then the setting apart of a portion of time for worship is also obligatory. Thus the fourth Commandment is seen to follow naturally the first three. They command a work to be done. It prescribes the means by which this work is to be performed.

That this law is moral and not positive is shown further by the fact that the penalty of death was attached to the breach of it. This penalty was not inflicted upon an offender against any law of ritual.

3. A third argument in support of the position maintained in the paper, is that the law of the Sabbath rests upon a universal and permanent ground. It is true that in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, the deliverance from Egypt is mentioned as the ground of the command, and that this text has been used to support the position that for the rest of God's people, who did not share the Exodus from Egypt, there is no ground for observing the Sabbath. But it is to be observed that both in Exodus and Deuteronomy, the whole decalogue is prefaced by reminding the people of their deliverance from Egypt. The argument against the universal obligation of the Sabbath law derived from the mention in Deuteronomy of the deliverance from Egypt as its ground, if it proves anything, proves that the whole decalogue has no authority over us, because we did not share in the Exodus. The fact that this deliverance was spoken of as a reason why the Hebrews should keep the Sabbath does not prove that this was the only reason

why it was binding upon them. Again, the command as given in Exodus is based on a ground which has validity for the whole human race, namely the fact that in six days the Lord created the heavens and the earth and rested on the seventh day. In Exodus a ground is assigned to this command which is valid for all men. In Deuteronomy we find in addition, a ground valid for the Hebrews alone. The less general ground does not exclude the more general.

It is said that God made the Sabbath a sign between Himself and the Hebrews (Ex. xxxi. 13-17; Ezek. xx. 12, 20). And hence it has been inferred that the Sabbath was a mere Levitical type destined to pass away when Christ came. But although the Sabbath was a sign, it was more than a sign. Israel was commanded to make the first great law of love announced in Deut. vi. 6, a sign between God and His people. No one argues that the law of love is abolished because it was a sign of God's covenant with His people. Again the decalogue itself is spoken of as a witness to God's presence with His people. The ideas of "a sign" and "a witness" are similar ideas. No one argues that the decalogue is obsolete because it was "a witness." There would be as much force in such arguments, as there is in the argument that the Sabbath was a temporary institution because God made it a sign between Himself and His people. Might not a permanent institution be selected as a sign as well as a temporary institution?

4. A fourth argument is that the prophets treated the law of the Sabbath as a moral and perpetual commandment. The prophets were the enemies of mere ceremonialism. Isaiah condemned in scathing words the false religion that made much of fasting and afflicting the soul, but did not loose the bonds of wickedness or undo the heavy burdens, or let the oppressed go free or break the yoke, or feed the hungry or house the outcast, or clothe the naked. Now if the Sabbath law were merely a positive and ceremonial command, we would expect to find the prophets laying comparatively little stress upon Sabbath observance. As a matter of fact, however, what we do find is exactly the opposite of this, Isaiah declared that the eunuchs, who keep the Sabbaths, will find in the house of God a place and a name better than of sons and daughters. They shall have an everlasting name that shall not be cut off. The sons of strangers

who keep the Sabbath shall be brought to the holy mountain and be made joyful in the house of prayer. Again, the same prophet says, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou deight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy Father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it" Jeremiah said to the people of his day that the prosperity of the city depended upon the hallowing of the Sabbath and warned them of danger from the divine displeasure if they disregarded the observance of the holy day. Ezekiel reproached his nation for having polluted the Sabbath which God had established as a sign between Himself and His people. These instances may suffice to show that the prophets treated this matter of Sabbath observance, not as if the Sabbath law were on the same footing as ritualistic requirements, but as if it were upon a level with the moral precepts of the Mosaic legislation.

5 A fifth argument is that Christ recognized the authority of the Sabbath law. The authority of our Lord is often claimed by those who oppose the position maintained here. It is alleged that when Christ defended His disciples against those who accused them of Sabbath breaking because they plucked corn to satisfy their hunger, He used His authority as Messiah to repeal the Mosaic law and to introduce a freer and more lenient law for the new dispensation. But this assertion involves a misunderstanding of the whole case. Our Lord and His opponents agreed in regarding the Mosaic law of the Sabbath as still binding. It is incredible that the Saviour who observed the Mosaic law scrupulously up till His death, whose last free act was the keeping of the Passover should here be setting aside the old Sabbath law. The dispute was not about the authority of the Mosaic law, but about its interpretation. The Pharisees interpreted the law to require a man to go hungry rather than put forth his hand to pluck a few ears of corn. Our Lord denied the correctness of this interpretation. He did not relax the law. He explained it. According to the explanation of the Pharisees, the disciples were Sabbath breakers. According to

our Lord's explanation they were not exposed to that charge. But Christ did not claim for His disciples exemption from the law of the Sabbath given by Moses.

Again, from the teaching of Christ, that the observance of the Sabbath must give way to deeds of mercy, it has been inferred that He looked upon the Sabbath command as ceremonial. The principle, it is said, on which this teaching of our Lord rests is that positive and ceremonial commands must always give way to those which are moral and perpetual. Since, then, mercy takes precedence of Sabbath observance, the former must be a moral and the latter a ceremonial duty. But it is also a recognized principle that some moral duties must give way to others. For example, worship is a moral duty, but it must be set aside to save a drowning man from his peril. So that even if our Lord subordinated Sabbath observance to deeds of mercy, that would not prove one of them to be a moral and the other to be a ceremonial duty. They might both be moral duties and yet one of them might be subordinated to the other. But Christ does not subordinate Sabbath observance to mercy. What He teaches is that the performance of deeds of mercy is proper Sabbath observance.

It need scarcely be said that our Lord's declaration, "The Sabbath was made for man," is perverted, when it is quoted in support of the relation or abrogation of the Sabbath law. These words simply declare that the design of the Sabbath is a humane one; that it ministers to man's true welfare. Before the advocates of greater license in Sabbath observance can gain any legitimate support from these words, they must prove that the law of the Sabbath as given by Moses and properly interpreted does not advance human welfare. Then they would be entitled to say that the Sabbath of Moses and the Sabbath of Christ are two different things. But it is precisely this proof which is not forth coming.

Our Saviour's concluding words in this Sabbath controversy, as recorded by Matthew, have been misinterpreted. The words are these, "For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath." They have been thus paraphrased. "The Son of man, agreeably to His authority, is able to relax the Sabbath day just as the other legal ceremonies." And again, "Here He saith that power is given to him to release His people from the necessity

of observing the Sabbath." But observe that our Lord is here giving the reason for declaring His disciples innocent of the charge of Sabbath breaking. They are innocent "for the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath." He would not have allowed them to break this law without rebuking them. The fact that he did not reprove them shows that they had done nothing wrong. The examination of this Sabbath controversy makes it clear that Christ recognized the authority of the Sabbath law.

6. A sixth and concluding argument may be put in a negative form. The writings of Paul furnish no objection to the position that the law of the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual commandment. Three passages in the Pauline epistles, are held by some to teach that the law of the Sabbath is positive and ceremonial and therefore temporary. These passages are: (1) Romans xiv. 5-6, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemed every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth it not unto the Lord, he doth not regard it. (2) Gal. iv. 10, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years." (3) Col. ii. 16, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come, but the substance is Christ."

Two answers have been given to the objection against the perpetual authority of the Sabbath law based on these passages. One is that the condemnation pronounced by Paul applies to the observance of the Sabbath days and other days prescribed under the Mosaic economy. The Sabbath day referred to is the seventh day Sabbath. Judaizers held and taught that the observance of this and other days, and of Levitical rites was essential to salvation. According to this view, the first day was not at this time called the Sabbath. For this reason and because its observance was not looked upon as an essential condition of salvation, the words of Paul do not apply to the Christian Sabbath.

The other answer is that the term Sabbath does not mean the weekly Sabbath, but Sabbatic periods or days connected with the ceremonial law. According to this view, the whole

discussion has to do with ceremonial observances commanded by Moses and not with anything commanded in the decalogue.

I present this imperfect summary of the evidence in favor of the position, that the law of the Sabbath is a moral and perpetual commandment, in the hope that it may in some measure be helpful to the discussion of this most important subject.

**OBEDIENCE TO THE LAST COMMAND THE
SECRET OF INDIVIDUAL BLESSING
AND POWER.**

— — —
BY REV. M. N. BETHUNE.
— — —

I N the text of the subject given us for our consideration this evening there are two propositions which I shall seek briefly to examine and apply—viz.: as relates to the basis and the secret of blessing.

(1) *The last command is the basis of blessing.* This involves all blessing viewed in the broadest sense.

Can any one command be the basis of all blessing? Is not each blessing vitally attached to a command of its own, for which it only can be held responsible? Yes. But one command may be broad enough to include all that we mean when we deal with the idea of obedience.

The last command is. All else is but an outgrowth from this. Properly understood it involves the entire work of the Church, and, therefore, the possibilities of Christian obedience.

Two passages in the New Testament should never be separated. They represent the dual foundation of the Church's existence.

"God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son," etc.—John iii. 16. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel,"—Mark x. 15. This second finds its enforcement in a third. And when "He is come He will convince the world of Sin,"—Jno. xvi. 8. The "world" is in all these passages. God and the world is the first—atonement. The Church and the world the second—witnessing. The spirit and the world the third—convincing. On these three the dispensation rests. One is yet to follow. That has to do with the termination of the Church's work here. "He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness,"—

Acts xvii. 31. Meanwhile the witnessing of grace goes on, until the period of judgment arrives. Go back to the two first mentioned passages for a moment. Viewing them as the twin pillars of the Church, does not the question resolve itself into something like the following. By the first of these the Church is saved ; by the second she serves. By the first she receives a title to heaven ; by the second an occupation upon earth. By the first she receives life, by the second she enjoys communion. The first is the Church's foundation ; the second her commission. She is built upon the foundation ; she carries out the commission.

In the book of Acts, the book of the true Kingdom of God, we get this matter glorified by a new light : "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth,"—Acts i. 8. These were Christ's last words, and here is the spiritual programme for the direction of His disciples. Witnessing is the work of the Church ; Christ is the News, the Holy Spirit of God the Power, and the uttermost part of the earth the Realm. This is final. It is to be until He shall come again, according to the Angelic communication. Thus the base of the proposition given me for introduction is correct. The last command, involving, as it does, the essence of the Church's work, must necessarily be the test of her obedience, and, therefore, the secret of blessing. Let us remember this work is not sectional. It is not any one part of the earth I am to bear this witness to, but to man in general. There is to be no favouring process in one section, with neglect in another. I must not make any distinctions, far less set up petty rivalries. The message is one harmonious, progressive, organic whole, beautifully illustrated by the various sacred writers who speak specifically upon this point. Matthew uses the words "All nations." This is the racial idea, the tribal thought. Mark adds all the "world," the geographical idea, and every "creature," the individual idea. So, in every part of the world to all their manifold peoples and to every separate individual I am bound to send the gospel. Thus I repeat the base of the proposition is correct. This is the work of the Church ; this, therefore, is the outcome of her obedience ; this, in turn, the secret of her blessing.

(2) *Obedience to the last command is the secret of blessing.* Let our appeal be to the word of God. Where better can we look for an enforcement of this idea than in the incidents connected with the giving of the last commandment itself. That great missionary chapter, the 28th of Matthew, gives us a remarkably full conception of this matter. There the blessings are principally three in number, obedience the secret of them all. The three are: Communion with the Person of Christ; intimation of His Word and Will; experience of His Spirit. Himself; His Word; His Spirit. Are not these the organics of Christian life. May we not say: "Lord, by these things men live."

A word or two upon each of these rapidly:

(a) *Communion with the Person of Christ.* Begin at the sepulchre and with Mary. Lovingly she lingers round the place where her Lord had lain, when an angel appears with the words: "Come see"; "Go tell." One glance for self, then the passing on of the news. His command is obeyed with the result that Jesus meets with her by the way. Here is communion based on obedience, and such communion. Mark its advance. From the Angel to Christ Himself. From seeing the place where the Lord lay to seeing the Lord face to face. From the "quickly" of the Angel to the lengthening out of the interview as she worships at His feet. Here is advance all through. Advance in character in duration. But the interview is soon over. Again the words fall on her ear: "Go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, there shall they see me." The obedience now required is greater, the journey longer, the spirit more absolutely controlled. They go to Galilee, Jesus meets with them and for forty days speaks to them of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God. Here is great advance from the few moments by the wayside to the forty days in Galilee.

But this is not all. This interview ends likewise by the wider command of our Saviour: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations . . . and lo I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." Now the communion is complete. The forty days gives place to the "alway," but on what grounds? I answer a contemporary obedience upon their part. If Mary had not obeyed the Angel, would she have met Christ? No.

If the disciples had not gone unto Galilee, would they have enjoyed His presence for forty days? No. Must it not follow then if the Church does not go to the "all nations" she cannot have His presence "alway"? The tendency in all these blessings is to ripen to perfection, but only in proportion as the Church absorbs and carries out His will. And I believe that communion with Christ in the deepest, fullest, sweetest sense cannot be enjoyed except in unison with the purposes of God in the world.

(b) *Intimation of His Word and Will.* Just a word upon this. This follows naturally in the path of communion. Very much of our communion with Him is occupied with the intimation of His Word to us. It has two sides here—doctrinal, practical.

Doctrinal.—To Mary at the Tomb is revealed the truth of the Resurrection. Full of her mission she hurries to tell the news, when Christ meets her and discloses the doctrine of the Ascension, in the words, "I ascend unto My Father." Here is advance. It remains but to show that upon the slopes of Olivet, and at the last moment, angels appear and disclose the doctrine of the advent. Here is perfect intimation, as before we saw perfect communion. For these three things, His Resurrection, Ascension and Advent are the organics of the Person of Christ as communion, intimation and experience of His Spirit, are of every disciple of His. These truths were revealed part by part, and made in perfect accord with the receptivity of the Church in becoming absorbed in His Will. Between these latter two the plan for evangelization was disclosed, and even here in consulting the sacred narrative we find an enlarging view, for Matthew gives us "Evangelization and Organization": "Go" "teach" "baptize." Mark is occupied with "Results": "These signs shall follow." Luke with "Qualification": "Tarry ye . . . until ye be endued with power." John with "Authorization": "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. . . . Whosoever sins ye remit. . . . Whosoever sins ye retain."

Practical.—Just a sentence or two. To Mary at the way-side. In Galilee in convention. In Jerusalem waiting for the Spirit.

There, and onwards, making known His name. In each of these places, according to appointment, He met them. Would He have done so if they had failed to keep their engagement. The answer is in the negative. The same is true to-day. He reveals His Word and Will to us as we are carrying out His already received command.

(c) *Experience of His Spirit.* Let me ask, why should we change the principle when arriving at this point? And this is the very essence of the matter, practically face to face with us. If communion and intimation are conditional upon obedience, and only mature to perfection as the obedience becomes controlling, why should we suppose that the fulness of the Holy Ghost in all that the expression may imply as the experience of "the promise of the Father" can be enjoyed by the Church except on the basis that the last command of Christ be fully carried out?

I must confess looking at this matter in the light of the underlying principle guiding the administration of the blessings already touched upon, the conclusion seems inevitable. Perfect obedience now will mean perfect power as then it meant perfect communion and intimation.

Let us consider this matter to-night. The fulness of blessing comes in with the fulness of obedience. Have we as a Church given Christ this obedience yet? The result to the Church at large, would, it appears to me, be obvious. It would mean a copious outpouring of the Spirit of God upon the churches at home. And this is just what we need, and the lack of which we are continually deploring.

I believe this blessing in its completest sense cannot be expected until the "uttermost part of the earth" has been witnessed to by us. This is the limit of His Word and the secret of Power. Reaching this we may infer the fulness of blessing would be enjoyed, and in sending the Gospel abroad all the churches at home would receive their equivalent part in the descending shower of grace.

In more senses than one we require to return to apostolical times. That little pre-pentecostal prayer-meeting in Jerusalem might well serve as a guide to our attitude in regard to this matter.

"They were all with one accord in one place." Here is unity : unity of three characters. " All "—unity of numbers. " With one accord"—unity of sentiment. " In one place"—unity of locality. That was the primitive Church's spiritual condition as the foundation of reception in this matter. What was this unity in reference to? The command of Christ, and the promise of the Father. The evangelization of the world, and the descent of the Holy Spirit. It is unnecessary for me to say that the " promise " was kept, when the " command " was obeyed. The Spirit came. Might He not so come again? With all other meetings and conventions, and the age is characterized by them, may there not be room for one more, that one when all the Church, if possible—but this is hardly to be expected— or bodies of the Church, were united in prayer to God for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost in richest effusion, with the last command of Christ as the plea that breathes that petition towards heaven.

I am convinced the richest results would follow, and in calling down blessings upon others we ourselves would be proportionately enriched.

FORMS OF SABBATH DESECRATION PREVALENT.

— — —
BY REV. JAMES M'CAUL, B.A.
— — —

THE marked feature of our age is unresting activity. The race lives intensely. To keep pace with current events, a man must know almost intuitively—must think swiftly—must act promptly else he will soon be written a laggard, and be vastly outdistanced in the keen competition that prevails in everything and on every hand. Hence, as men make haste to win wealth, there is a powerful inducement to sacrifice the interests of others—and even their own best interests—in gratifying this ambition. Perhaps in no direction is this more keenly felt than in the insatiable greed that seizes some to get gold—to secure it at any cost—to gain it at any sacrifice.

It may fairly be questioned, I think, whether ever there was a period in the world's history when this characteristic held such dominant sway over the minds of men as it does in the present day. Against this spirit of our age, this temper of our time, the Church of God is solemnly bound to lift up her clarion voice. And this for two reasons. Because, firstly, she is commissioned to safeguard in every possible way the best interests of men, and, secondly, she is jealously to conserve the honor and glory of God. That both these are perilled by men yielding to the spirit of the age hardly needs proof.

On the one hand the tension and strain to which the human frame is subjected, in this ceaseless rush and nervous action of mind and body, will account for the number of lamentable suicides that continually shock society. It well explains the sudden break up and death of not a few overwrought and overstrained business and professional men. Here also is to be found one at least of the motives, that prompt men to violate the Sabbath law of a seventh day's rest after a six day's toil, the greed

of gain impelling its devotee to rob God of His reserved seventh, and himself of absolutely necessary relaxation.

With folly that is consummate and imprudence that is both perilous and short-sighted, man, in his ignorance and stupidity, would first violate, then ignore, then defy and finally recast the divine law.

During the Reign of Terror in France God's seventh day was abrogated and a tenth day Sunday substituted. The result only demonstrated afresh the folly of man and the wisdom of God.

Having made man for His own glory the Lord made the Sabbath and ordained it for man's good, making it minister to his essential need, physical, mental, moral and spiritual. As the key is suited to the wards of its lock, so the rest day of God fits into the very constitution of man's being, and opens the door that floods it with blessing.

Rightly, therefore, and righteously the Church is obligated to conserve for the race this most precious boon, a God given Sabbath, to guard with a holy jealousy against any and every infringement of its hallowed privileges, and to preserve the day in the integrity of the divine intent.

To the Christian Church as the custodian of God's sacred oracles, and to the Christian State as the divinely ordained instrument for preserving the social, civil and national liberties of His people, God has entrusted the responsibility of maintaining inviolate a seventh part of our time for reverent acts of divine worship, to both equally the command being given: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." In the carrying out of this command, the Lord has been graciously pleased so to interweave interests with us that while, on the one hand, we are thereby promoting His glory, we are on the other subserving our own best interests, both temporal and spiritual.

Now it is not affirming too much to say that both Church and State have been and are grievously remiss in the discharge of their obligations to this divine command, and there has been assigned to me to-day the unenviable duty of bringing a grave indictment against the Christian Church, against Christian society, and against the Christian State in this regard.

I address myself therefore to the duty of noting in the first place.

I.—*Some of the forms of Sabbath Desecration that prevail within the Church itself.*

Under this heading I would name, and with a deep sense of humiliation,—

(1) *Star preaching and star singing in the Lord's house on the Lord's day.*—To invite from a distance a preacher of brilliant talents and adding to the attraction a leading soprano of high culture, thereby drawing together a crowded audience for the purpose of excitement and money-making to the detriment of neighboring congregations, is surely a profaning of the Sabbath, and can scarcely be too severely characterized. One of our Presbyteries, in referring to this all too prevalent form of Sabbath desecration, justly remarks: "If it is sinful *per se* for railway companies to make money on the Sabbath, then it is worse to put up the Gospel for sale on Sunday and to make money out of the service of sacred song."

(2) *So called Sacred Sunday Concerts.*—Whether the object be to gratify the æsthetic taste, or to add to the Church revenues, or to influence non church goers to attend the means of grace, these Sunday Concerts can surely tend only in a greater or less degree to degrade God's day and destroy the sanctity of the Sabbath.

(3) *Church Parades on Sabbath.*—These are usually held, though not always in the afternoon, when our Sabbath schools are or ought to be in session. Being duly advertized the route of march is usually crowded with thousands of spectators—while the band discourses spirited, and maybe sacred music—the pageant, the display, the excitement, all combine to divert the attention of both old and young with-in measurable distance of the line of march, from the solemnity and sacredness of the Sabbath. It is much to be feared that the possible good accruing from such service for our militia, of whom we are justly proud, is purchased at too high a price.

(4) *Sabbath Afternoon Social Teas.*—A most insidious and demoralizing form of Sabbath desecration this is that is finding its way into not a few professedly Christian homes.

The telephone is called into liberal requisition to convene the impromptu party, if it has not been previously arranged for, and then not a few of those who have spent a most secular Sabbath afternoon, quiet their conscience by driving together in the evening to some popular place of worship in the neighborhood.

(5) *Sabbath Funerals and Sabbath Visiting.*—Happily these forms of Sabbath desecration are confined largely to rural districts, though sometimes practised in the more populous centres; in all cases to the injury of the regular service of God's house, to the great discomfort and inconvenience of many Christian homes, and to robbing the Sabbath of its sanctity.

(6) *Church Business Meetings on Sabbath.*—In cases not a few, sessions are called together. Sabbath school teachers meet, committees of Y.P.S. of C.E., missionary or other committees convene for the transaction of business on the Sabbath that in almost all cases should be relegated to a week day. The Church being bound to teach by her example that she holds the day in deepest reverence, should see to it that her example in this regard is not made a stumblingblock to others.

II.—*Some Forms of Sabbath Desecration that Prevail in the Christian Community*—perhaps not so directly under the control of the Church.

(1) *Secular Reading on Sabbath in Christian Homes.*—Very attractive Saturday-Sunday editions of our leading daily journals are regularly issued by a self-interested press. As works of art they are to be admired, as budgets of information they may be prized, but for Sabbath reading no devout Christian parent should peruse them himself or allow them to be placed within the reach of the members of his household on the Lord's Day. Very divisive is this insidious method of cultivating the taste and paving the way for the Sunday newspaper for which already there is such a demand in some quarters. How anxiously we strive to guard the bodies of our children from the infection of certain virulent diseases. Ought we to be less anxious to guard their souls from a still worse infection?

(2) *Encroachments on the Sabbath.*—These occur when the toilers of the week conduct their business to such late hours on the Saturday night as that the hours of the Sabbath are invaded. When the cutings of the Saturday so exhaust the pleasure-seekers physically, as that they must needs seek bodily rest in their homes on the Sabbath. When Christian men habitually set out from their homes on journeys of either business or pleasure on Sabbath evening and make choice of the Saturday night to return, and so rob God of the early hours of His day and unfit themselves for the sanctuary.

(3) *Saturday Evening Parties.*—Whether these parties be for dancing, for card-playing, or for whatever purpose convened, they are usually arranged with the deliberate intent of taking from the hours of God's day time that they think they cannot afford from their own business, or dare not take from that of their employer. In this matter God's demand is just as exacting as that of any employer, and most righteously so, and He is very jealous of the honor of His Sabbath and Sanctuary. Assuredly, therefore, He will require it at the hands of those who rob Him of what He rightfully claims as His own.

(4) *Saturday Excursions and Sports.*—No word should be uttered that would imply a condemnation of the much needed relaxation that the toilers of the week fittingly seek in their Saturday outing, nor of the healthful manly exercise that our youth of all classes enjoy in their Saturday afternoon athletic national games. Nor is one such word implied. But when the Saturday excursion extends, either in its limit of time or its resultant of fatigue, into the hours of the Lord's day so as to utterly unfit for the duties of that day, we who are jealous for the honor of God's day are bound to plead on its behalf, and admonish the Christian Community that such violation of God's law will not pass unpunished. The same holds true when the over-exhausting and fatiguing exercises of the Saturday field sports force so many of our youths to absent themselves from God's house in order to rest their jaded bodies. Let the excursions and sports be allocated to say the *Thursday* afternoon instead of Saturday, and we venture to affirm the demands of the school room, the college halls, the

offices, and business places of the city generally, on the *Friday*, will soon correct the extravagant abuse that is made of these otherwise adventitious and much to be commended out-door recreations and pastimes. But why should we expect and ask God to condone an offence against His day and law, that we neither look for nor expect in the school, college or counting house?

(5) *Desecrating the Sabbath at Summer Resorts.*—It seems sad that it should be so, but proof is not wanting to show that many professing Christian people when they repair to their summer resorts would seem to leave their religion behind them in their city homes. Many rural retreats and quiet country hamlets, where nature and the local dwellers invite the city toilers to seek refreshment and rest, have had their inhabitants contaminated, their peaceful Sabbath broken in upon and God's day openly desecrated by professing Christian people unblushingly engaged in visiting, pleasure-driving, fishing, boating, bathing and other pastimes on the Sabbath, while they frequently utterly neglect whatever ordinances of religion the locality may afford. Surely this ought not so to be. Certainly the city pastors should seasonably admonish their people in regard to these evil practices, so unthinkingly adopted by many, with a view to lessen it in future.

III.—*Forms of Sabbath Desecration Directly Chargeable to the State.*

It is the duty of the Christian State to secure for the Christian community the highest possible good for the greatest possible number. It is the duty of the Christian Church to create in the Christian community an enlightened Christian sentiment that will demand such legislative enactment as will secure the highest possible good to the greatest possible number. When such a demand is fittingly made and the State refuses to grant it, then the State is arraignable before the bar of the Christian community or public opinion, and the Christian community has a right to utter pronouncement of condemnation and secure satisfaction through an enlightened public sentiment.

When the State does grant the enactments sought, the Christian community is bound to see that a healthy public

sentiment is maintained for the carrying out of these enactments.

The State may sometimes, but it does not often, legislate in advance of public opinion. If it did such legislation would be futile. Upon the Church, then, and the Christian community generally, devolves the responsibility of creating such a sentiment as will imperatively demand the enactment of such laws as will be for the greatest good of the greatest number. I take it that when this sentiment is created and this demand made for the enactment of a law for the better observance of the Lord's Day, our legislators will not feel themselves at liberty to refuse the demand thus made. Sections of the Christian community, as notably our own General Assembly, and some other ecclesiastical bodies, have passed judgment of disapprobation upon the Senate in throwing out Mr. Charlton's Bill after it had passed the House of Commons. This action of the Senate is due to one of two causes. Either the Senate considers itself independent of public opinion, and therefore can set it at defiance, or the Senate believes that public sentiment is not ripe enough for the enactment of the measure and therefore withholds its sanction to it.

Many think that the former accounts for the Senate's attitude. However this may be, there is now created an urgent demand upon the Christian community to so make its voice heard in our Legislative Halls that even the Senate may be made to feel that the intelligent and united sentiment of a Christian people is the highest court of appeal.

Apart from this enactment of a law for the better observance of the Sabbath, the State is directly responsible for the observance of the Sabbath in the departments of the public service over which it has direct control.

This is true of her post offices, her canals, her graving docks and her ocean mails. Yet it is known she allows in not a few cases the post offices to transact postal business on Sunday, demands the presence of postal clerks at offices at such an hour on Sabbath evenings as debars them from church privileges, has under her direct control and pay men working on Sabbath on her graving docks, permits the public use of her canals on the

Sabbath, and allows and sanctions the departure from port on Sabbath of the ocean steamers that are chartered by her to carry the nation's mails. In none of these cases can the work be said to be that of necessity or mercy. This is assuredly sinning in high places and it is fitting' that the State should know that the sense of the Christian community feels outraged thereby. There are other forms of Sabbath desecration for the prevention of which the State has already legislated, but in many cases the enactments lie as a dead letter on the statute book. This is notably true in regard to the keeping open on Sabbath of candy stores, tobacco shops, bean stalls, fruit stores, newspaper stands, drinking saloons, butcher's shops etc., which evil prevails largely in Montreal and to some extent elsewhere.

It is equally true in the matter of Sunday steamboat excursions. By enactment the Island Ferry Company in this city are permitted to ply their steamers on Sabbath for the convenience of the residents who usually locate on the Island during the summer months, ostensibly for the purpose of coming over to and returning from public worship on the Lord's Day. In the furtherance of its own pecuniary interests and, in defiance of the oft expressed Christian sentiment of the city, the Ferry Company during the past and previous summer organized a series of Sabbath concerts, which they termed "Sacred" and to which they carried thousands of the citizens to the great gain of the company financially, to the great injury of the many who take part in this form of Sabbath desecration, the bringing of dishonor on God's law and the discredit of the good name of our Sabbath observing city.

Now this is either done lawfully under the charter that the Company possesses, or it is done in contravention of its charter and in violation of the law. If the former be true, then a new and more stringent form of enactment should at once be secured; if the latter, then effective steps should at once be taken by an enlightened Christian community to prevent this greed of gain from so overriding our laws.

From the port of Toronto also there sails a large steamer every Saturday evening to a port of the neighboring Republic, carrying during the season hundreds of our citizens, but in al-

most all cases upon the deliberate purpose of Sabbath desecration with its accompanying exercises and painful debauchery. Arriving at the American port at 9 o'clock on Sabbath morning, the excursionists find their way chiefly to a neighboring park, where every temptation in the way of amusements and pastimes is provided by those who are only too willing to cater to such for the gain they get. The steamer leaves the American port at 9 o'clock on Sabbath evening, and arrives in Toronto at an early hour on Monday morning, thus escaping a direct violation of Canadian law, and sinning under a more lax American law.

Surely some redress should be sought for an evil of such proportions as this. The State is bound to amend its law so as to correct this abuse. And the Christian community is bound to demand the amendment. If it be true, as I believe it is, that our city police have under the present arrangement but one Sabbath in the month off from duty to attend the means of grace, such change in civic rule should be made if necessary as to secure for those guardians of our city's peace the exercise of their rights of Christian citizenship.

A growing form of Sabbath desecration that only the State can deal with is the frequent Sunday meet and Sunday trip to some rural or suburban district of many of our city bicyclists, disturbing the quiet of the country or village Sabbath, in many cases giving themselves up to riotous excess, in all setting at defiance God's law, and paving the way for making Sabbath observance a dead letter. Even in what might be considered a legitimate use of the bicycle on the Lord's day, this use must be judiciously resorted to on the part of Christians lest their good be evil spoken of.

Our street car Sunday traffic has happily been settled for a time, but we may rest assured that the advocates of this form of Sabbath desecration have not given up the contest. They tell us that they are only biding their time. Our success in this conflict hangs upon and will be the reward of eternal vigilance. We cannot afford to yield one iota of the vantage gained. A great corporation, egged on by an insatiable thirst for gain, and backed by a godless community, will leave no stone unturned to gain their object. Let us hold firmly and train faithfully our

people in the Christian sentiment that will hold the vantage we now possess. We are a tower of strength to others in the struggle; for their sakes as well as for our own we should be faithful to God and loyal to our city.

There remains yet one other form of Sabbath desecration with which only the State can deal—and that is Sabbath railway traffic, the treatment of which does not fall within the scope of this paper.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE IN ITS RELATION TO GOVERNMENT.

BY JOHN A. PATERSON, M.A.

THE Utilitarian School of Jeremy Bentham and James Mill declared that the end of Government is to increase to the utmost the pleasures, and diminish to the utmost the pains which men derive from each other. The theory of an original contract had been suggested by Locke and adopted by Blackstone but Bentham and Mill found Government sufficiently justified by its utility, while in place of conformity to the laws of God and nature, which appeared to them to rest too much on vague assertion and opinion, they invented "the-greatest-happiness-of-the-greatest-number" principle as the touchstone of right and wrong both as respects moral questions and those that are covered by the laws of the realm. Such a theory of Government does not include the enforcement of moral obligations and would more fitly appeal to a tribe of Yahoos scuffling over carrion than to the type of humanity we boast ourselves to be. Other philosophers teach that Government exists to protect the person and property of men, and if property is applied in a larger sense than mere worldly pelf, and includes the recognition of the God-given right to every soul-endowed being of cessation from all necessary work during the first day of the week, then such a theory comes more nearly up to the level of a truer philosophy, truer because it is holier. While still others tell us that the object of Government is to make it easy for men to do right and hard for them to do wrong, and that principle, in my opinion, includes more than the other; it bulks more largely in the mind. The precepts of Jesus Christ are do unto others as ye would they should do to you; love your neighbour as yourself. Understood in an enlarged sense but not in the Utilitarian sense these precepts are a direction to every man to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Some theorists (I will not call them philosophers) allege

that the end of government is to provide that men should derive the highest amount of profit from their labour. That would fit a state of society where men are mere working automata or earning machines, destitute of moral obligations, with everything here and nothing hereafter ; but even on this low principle we can find a footing for Sabbath observance ; for it has been proved by the logic of experience, by the experiments of history, that if men would make the highest amount of profit from their labour they must " remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," even if everything is here and nothing is hereafter. Work can be done better, men can be made stronger, a higher morality can be evolved ; longer lives, healthier frames, quicker powers, greater wealth can be produced, and higher dividends can be earned, if men work only six-sevenths of their time than if they work the whole seven-seventh thereof ; and if Government can provide for this, and even if they provide for no more, very much is accomplished.

The French Revolutionists found God's fractions were right and theirs were wrong. They enacted a Sabbath every tenth day and it would not work. The tenth was the unreasonable fraction devised by the Goddess of Reason, and the seventh was the fraction created by the wise decree of the God of the Universe. The same mighty power taught the bees to make their cells hexagonal because thereby the greatest volume could be contained in the least amount of surrounding surface. The mathematicians proved that. The bees obey and never rebel. God's arithmetic, his theory of numbers, is always right. Another department of divinely prescribed duty shows that God's will is involved in tenths as well as in sevenths. But this is a world of not only mortal brawn and perishable brain, but of never-dying soul. Bentham's principle to increase to the utmost the pleasures and to decrease to the utmost the pains which men derive from each other, is, in very truth, low enough in the face of the experience and mysteries of higher things. But even on this narrow line (I will not call it plane) the principle of Sabbath observance can find a lodgment ; for the true and abiding pleasures of mankind are increased, and the pains and troubles of life are decreased, by periodic restfulness, even if that restfulness be an enforced one. The constructor of a machine, a

watch for instance, understands best the law of its well-being and is best fitted to lay down and enforce that law. Society is a machine, a most complicated mechanism, a creation by the great Artificer, and he alone is fitted to lay down the laws of its well-being, and, moreover, to enforce these laws in his own way, or by the power of Governments, which are his vice-gerents on earth. One of these laws is rest one day in seven, and if individual or national life is to be conserved, and no one doubts that; and if Government exists to conserve individual and national life, and no one doubts that; then Government must enact laws for the observance of the Lord's Day and must enforce these laws, as it does its other laws, by penal provisions. But we are told we cannot make people moral by act of Parliament, and men and newspapers grow didactic and advise us not to seek legislation in these matters, but seek to accomplish our very praiseworthy ends by moral suasion. This species of reasoning, if followed out to a legitimate conclusion, would stop the course of further legislation on many subjects. The answer to it is so manifest that I do not think any man who has understanding enough to carry him past the first proposition of Euclid can honestly believe that there is anything in it. True we cannot make men moral by act of Parliament, but we can make it hard for them to do wrong and easy for them to do right by act of Parliament. No one objects to laws directed and enforced by severe penalties against the man who steals from his fellowman a dollar or who strikes him on the face. Sabbath day rest is a God-given right; it is a property which is every man's and of which no man should be deprived even as no man can be deprived of the free uses of air and light. It is a franchise, a property far dearer than such as relates to his physical welfare only, because it not only compasses his physical well-being, but it is a property the free user thereof projects its influence past the confines of time and brings with it a benediction for eternity; a property therefore more valuable by far than money and lands and goods and therefore one which it is the bounden duty of Government to preserve for the individual and for the collocation of individuals called the nation, and the bounden duty of Government to see that no man or combination of men, shall be permitted to reach forth their hands and reft it

from their neighbor. No sane man will say, "Leave thieves and assassins to the holy influence of moral suasion," and why should such snatterers be tolerated while they break the atmosphere with their little spray of nonsense and wisely chatter of "moral suasion" when the dearest God-given right of Sabbath day rest is in question. Any Government which looks supinely on while a corporation can say to its employees, either directly or indirectly, "Work on Sabbath or leave our service," is recreant to its trust and thus allows a theft of the dearest property, an assassination of man's most valuable rights.

The Mosaic law said, "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark;" blame falls on him that merely mislays a stone, but a state of society that allows or even endures the removal of such a landmark as the Sabbath day, is thrice wrong; wrong to itself, wrong to the individual, and wrong to its God; and the men that take up the weapons of fair argument and legitimate agitation against such a removal, or even against any obliteration of such a landmark, are thrice armed because their "quarrel is just."

There is, therefore, need for specific legislation in every nation for the protection of the individual in his Lord's Day rights. Not only so, but, moreover, specific legislation is a fountain of education and instruction. The Statute Book is a mighty schoolmaster; the school, the pulpit, the press are great educators, mighty engines of reform, but crystallize your reform into a Statute and you have a tremendous force added to your educative process. A familiar instance of the instructive and educative effect of a Statute is at once furnished by the laws regarding election bribery, for many years now part of the statute law of our land. The time was before these statutes were passed that bribery at elections was carried on almost openly and with the most brazen effrontery. Men who in ordinary business possessed the most honourable reputations, and who would not stoop to any meanness or dissimulation in a transaction between them and their neighbours, viewed the morality of election contests with an easy indifference and could put a dollar (and generally in the plural number) where it would do the most good with the most surpassing dexterity. But when the statutes as to bribery were passed they were observed at first

through fear of consequences, and in course of time by their continued observance and by the evil results that followed from their breach, they became mighty moulders of public opinion and eminent educators of public morality, so that men who occupied neutral ground before became convinced that the whole practice was wrong and mended their ways accordingly. So, too, with temperance legislation. Legislation to be effective must reflect the will of the people and to produce the best results must not be too far in advance of the will of the minority which opposed its enactment. When these two circumstances concur legislation is not only protective but educative. Who will deny but that the legislation as to the license laws and Local Option laws has had a most salutary effect upon the popular mind ; has educated it and prepared the way for the result of the Prohibition Plebiscite which testified how the popular pulse throbbed ? And so, too, with any Sabbath Observance law, the enactment of which must teach and train and convince ; and if so then the reverse just as truly holds, that the want of a reasonably strong Sabbath Observance law will assuredly vitiate public sentiment and debase public morality.

There is this, moreover, to be said when Sabbath legislation is contrasted with temperance legislation. In regard to the latter we have been told that the country is not prepared for prohibition and we must continue the work of education on temperance lines further so that the law, if passed, may be respected and effective. Excess in the drinking habits of society is an excrescence on the body politic of late years and is of modern growth, and therefore it is said we must " learn to labour and to wait," to wait until it can be made effective. But with this Sabbath question it is totally different. It is no modern question ; it began long ago, long before the Sinaitic thunderrings ; its principle is no growth of modern times, but the invasion of its principle is a growth of modern times, and it is a case not of conquering new territory, but of holding on to the present territory and of re-conquering what we have in our negligence let go to the enemy. The case of temperance legislation is that of erecting a new gate to the city as a barrier against increasing wrong ; the case of Sabbath legislation is that of holding on to the gate we have and fortifying it more

staunchly lest some Samson of evil uproot its foundation and carry it off. The Sabbath is the door of the week, the gates of the city, and in this effort to conserve the Sabbath let there be no rest, let there be no Sabbath; for the activities of good should have no Sabbath; and let us see to it that the activities of evil have a long, eternal Sabbath, yea, a never-ending, Dead Sea stagnation.

But let us now inquire what specific Lord's Day legislation we possess in Ontario and the state of the law resulting therefrom.

It is needless for me to discuss at length the difference between the *lex scripta* and the *lex non scripta*. The *lex non scripta*, or the unwritten common law, contains within it the basal principle of Sabbath Observance. Christianity is part of the common law of England and therefore also of Canada. Her salutary principles are the bulwarks of our liberty, are embedded into the very structure of our jurisprudence, and are the buttresses of our civilization. And so we find Sir Edward Coke, three hundred years ago, quoting this maxim: "*Dies Dominicus non est juridicus*." Throughout the British Empire the Sabbath day is a *dies non*; that is to say, it is not a day but *the day*; so far lifted up beyond the level of other days that it is not classified with ordinary secular days, but rests on a proud pre-eminence, clear and away beyond the cloud and dust and the hurly-burly of the common business days. This may be called a *lex non scripta* in the sense that it is a law not written on tablets made with hands, but yet a *lex scripta* because written in a more imperishable manner upon the hearts and consciences of the people of the realm.

The statutory Sabbath law dates in our history from the 27th year of Henry II. and on through the Parliaments of James I. and Charles I. down to the 29th year of Charles II. (1678) when, an act was passed, which is the real foundation of our present Ontario Statute, R.S.O., Cap. 203, commonly known as the Lord's Day Act. Under this Ontario Statute a prosecution was undertaken against an island steamer plying in Toronto Bay on Sunday and a conviction was obtained which on appeal was not disturbed (See *Queen vs. Tinning*, II. U.C., Q B. 636). Later on, in 1882, convictions were obtained in the case of the

old steamer *City of Toronto* for carrying on Sabbath, between Toronto and Niagara, passengers who were not travellers within the exception of the statute, but those convictions were quashed by the Court of Queen's Bench on the ground that under the then law there could be no safe distinction made between "travellers" for pleasure and for business (See *Queen vs. Daggett* and *Queen vs. Fortier*, I.O.R. 537). Thereupon the Lord's Day Act was amended by Ontario Statute of 1885, which makes the required distinction and attaches a penalty of \$400 for a breach of the law.

The next step of importance in the history of Provincial Legislature, and which interests much the citizens of Toronto, is the Toronto Railway Act of 1892, whereby it is provided that "no cars shall be run on the Lord's Day until a Sunday service has been approved of by the citizens by a vote taken on the question;" but it is enacted in effect by Sec. I., that such a vote shall not legalize any contravention of the "Lord's Day Act." And that Act is therefore left to its supremacy.

The lately established Provincial Lord's Day Alliance took its own part in watching the Ontario Legislation of last session, and the Electric Ry. Act of 1895 expressly forbids Sunday traffic on that part of the new lines of Electric Railway extending more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles beyond a city or town, with some exception as to milk trains at special hours of the day. The position of old lines of Electric Railway and that part of the new lines lying within the $1\frac{1}{2}$ mile limit, is by inference left to the operation of the Sabbath law as it stands without the help of the Act of 1895.

We have all read in classical fable that the infant Hercules reached forth from his cradle and strangled two monsters that were on mischief intent. The triumphs in the kingdom of force have their counterparts in the kingdom of mind and morals, and history in other guises repeats itself. The Provincial Lord's Day Alliance has thus far justified its existence in thus having already put forth its powers successfully although yet only in swaddling clothes.

I desire from this platform to especially thank the Hon. E. H. Bronson, a member of the Ontario Cabinet, and the chairman of the Railway Committee of the House, for the interest

that he evinced in guarding, by the Electric Railway Bill of 1895, the Lord's Day rights of the people of this Province. Sir Oliver Mowat, the Premier, and the other members of his Government, gave the subject much favourable attention, and so also did members of the House of not only both political parties, but of all political parties (for remember we are in 1895), but I take the liberty of especially mentioning the name of the Hon. E. H. Bronson because the Bill was under his special charge and advocacy.

Much yet, however, remains to be done. Legislation in this regard is far from complete. The employer should be made as responsible for a breach of the Lord's Day Act as the employee; the rich corporation which orders unnecessary work on the Lord's Day should be punished as well as the poor wage earner, who, for daily bread, is too often compelled to do the illegal work. The right to restrain by injunction a breach of the Lord's Day Act should be made clearer and relieved of its present technical objections.

I would, before closing, bespeak from the members of this Synod, and from the vast influence which this Synod represents, their vigorous support of the Provincial Lord's Day Alliance and of its objects, not only by approval and encouragement, but that each member of the Synod become a member of the Alliance and promote the establishment of branches in every city, town and village within its domain.